



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Jewish peasant of Galilee. Dr. Drummond has some interesting passages on the influence of Philo in preparing the matrix for the new ideal, and there is no one better qualified than he to deal with this subject. One would have liked to have seen him also treat of its relation with the analogous conception of the Jewish Messiah, which he has also made the subject of special study. It is clear that the next stage of theological investigation must be both to separate and to deal separately with the historic Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, and the ideal Christ or Christs of Paul and John. Dr. Drummond has every qualification for dealing with the latter subject.

JOSEPH JACOBS.

Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums. Von MAX FRIEDLANDER.
Wien : 1894.

THE following is an analysis of the contents of this important work :—

Chapter I.—“Die Göttliche Mittelkraft.” The Jewish idea of God was purified by contact in the schools of Alexandria with Greek philosophy, especially with Platonism. Anthropomorphic ideas were discarded, and the Logos introduced as intermediary between God, who is the author of good alone, and matter, which is transitory and evil. In the earlier period of Alexandrine Judaism, the Schechina, or *δόξα θεοῦ*, was regarded as such a divine intermediary power; and the Wisdom of God was similarly conceived.

Justin Martyr depends for his explanation of the distinction between the Father and the Son on this Alexandrine philosophy when he says that God before creation produced out of himself a self-conscious power (*δύναμιν τινα λογικὴν*) called the Holy Spirit, the glory of the Lord, *δόξα κυρίου*, and identical with the Son, with Wisdom, with an angel, with God, with Lord, and with the Word. This power issued from God without loss to him, just as the word issues from the human mind without loss to it or diminution of it.

The Book of Sirach, though a Palestinian work and originally written in Hebrew, is coloured by Alexandrine thought in its representation of Wisdom as a power mediating God with man and with the world. The Book of the Pseudo-Solomon, which is earlier than Philo, is still more definite; and Origen identified with the only-born Son and with the Logos the Wisdom which, according to that book, is *ἀτμὶς τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀπορροία τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰλικρινῆς*. This

breath, said Origen, is something real and objective ; is Christ ; is "the Power and Wisdom of God," to use Paul's phrase.

This hypostatizing of Wisdom as a real person numerically distinct from God is first found in Justin Martyr. The identification of her with the Word, however, begins in Pseudo-Solomon, and is completed in Philo. The same conception of a power mediating man and the world with God appears in the fragments of Aristobulus and in the letter of Aristeeas. In Philo, however, the conception of Sophia gradually recedes, and its place is taken by the masculine Logos. He is Lord of the Divine Powers, through him God made and maintains the world ; he is the Shadow of God, throned at his right hand and interpreting his behests. This Logos includes in itself the goodness of God, by which the world was made, and the might of God, by which it is ruled.

But the Logos also mediates between God and man. He atones and pleads for man with God, is our High Priest. Like Wisdom (according to Pseudo-Solomon), so the word was aforesaid with Abraham, Jacob, and Moses ; appeared to the latter in the burning bush, and was the pillar of cloud in the wilderness. He is sent by the Father to mankind, and rejoices in his mission.

As to the independent personality of the Word, Philo is not quite consistent. His statements often imply a person distinct from the Father, yet he was unconscious that such statements prejudiced his monotheism. It is a narrow thread, indeed, by which his Logos hangs from God ; but the separation thereof as a "second God" was only completed in Christianity.¹ Thus Justin asserts the Son to be one Essence with the Father ; but he is a distinct person, and numerically separate.

The references in the Synoptic Gospels to the "Divine Power" are due to Alexandrine influence ; which is still more apparent in Paul, who saw in Christ a pre-existent power and wisdom of God. The same influence is yet more definite and clear in John's Gospel and in the works of early Fathers, such as Clement of Alexandria, Theophilus of Antioch, Athanasius, etc.

Gnostic Christianity is equally to be referred to Alexandrine Judaism, and was in some forms as old as the Apostles, *e.g.*, as presented in the episode of Simon Magus. Just as some held Simon to be the Power of God, so others held Melchizedek to have been, Jesus being merely the successor of the latter.

Friedländer sums up thus :—Speculation in Jerusalem was in Jesus' day closely bound up with speculation in Alexandria. Jerusalem supplied the Revealed Law, Alexandria an allegorical account of it in accordance with methods of Greek philosophy, which reacted on Judæa itself.

¹ We must observe, however, that Philo calls the λόγος α δεύτερος θεός.

Jerusalem taught the Messiah doctrine, Alexandria that of the Divine Dynamis or Power. In Judæa the idea of a bodily resurrection was uppermost, in Alexandria that of a spiritual resurrection only.

Chapter II.—“Pharisæer und Am-haarez.” There was a revolt on the part of the Am-haarez, or country party of Palestine, against the Pharisees, who insisted on innumerable ceremonies and rites as essential to holiness, which the humbler classes could not perform. The latter also, being in constant and liberalising contact with Greeks and Gentiles, learned to despise the righteousness of the Pharisees, especially of that hypocritical class of them against whom the denunciations of the Gospels are levelled. The antagonism was increased by the contempt of the Pharisees for the poor as unclean, a contempt which finds expression even in Hillel, who declared that “an Am-haarez cannot be holy.” The *Assumptio Mosis* is a work written soon after, if not before, the destruction of the Temple by Titus, and is a cry raised in behalf of the country people against the domination of the Pharisees, who are described in it as “homines dolosi, sibi placentes, ficti in omnibus suis,” “whose leaven is hypocrisy.” In the Gospels we see Jesus as the champion of the religiously-despised and oppressed country people, combating the formalism of the Pharisees, who “shut up the Kingdom of Heaven against men.” Josephus himself testifies that the Pharisees imposed on the people many prescriptions not to be found in the Mosaic Law; that they were ever intriguing in order to have the control of affairs in their own hands, and to keep the people in a religious and spiritual nonage. The Talmud itself (*Sota*, 22*b*) acquaints us with the hypocrisy and ambitious intrigues of a certain class of Pharisees, and elsewhere terms them “queruli et falaces, celantes se ne possint cognosci, impii in scelere, pleni et iniquitate . . . et manus eorum et mentes immunda tractabunt et os eorum loquetur ingentia et superdicent: noli (tu me) tangere, ne inquines me.” In the reign of Agrippa I. the influence of the worldly and ambitious class of Pharisees culminated. Reading between the lines of Josephus, one can see that Agrippa was a whited sepulchre of the worst description, and that the better and more spiritually-minded Pharisees of the time also felt him to be such.

To the time immediately succeeding the death of Agrippa I. (44 A.D.), belong the denunciations of the Pharisees in Matthew's Gospel; and they form the earliest stratum of the Gospel teaching, since in them Jesus is not yet represented as having broken with the Pharisaic observances (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3, and 23). In the last passage Jesus insists on the duty of observing the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith, without, however, neglecting to pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin. In strong contrast with the conservatism of these passages stand others (Matt. xv., foll., and ix. 14-18), which reveal a complete breach with the teaching and observances of the

Pharisees. Once thus begun, the progress of religious reform could not be arrested, and before long the Sabbath itself was assailed (Matt. xii. 8 ; Mark ii. 27 ; Luke vi. 5). In their conservatism the vigorous denunciations of the *Assumptio Mosis* (chap. vii.) seem to belong to the same age as those of Matt. chap. xxiii., and to proceed from the same stratum of opinion, viz., from literary members of the Am-haarez, who recoiled from the vice, hypocrisy and intrigues of certain Pharisees, but had not yet repudiated the body of Pharisaic doctrines and observances.

Chap. III. Der Therapeutismus. The treatise *De Vita Contemplativa* was not written by Philo, yet in his age, and by an immediate successor and imitator. The religious community described in that treatise consisted of heretical Alexandrine Jews who had carried the allegorisation of the Scripture so far as to discard and reject altogether the literal fulfilment of its precepts. They thus went beyond the standpoint of Philo and of the Allegorist school of which he is the chief surviving representative. For Philo always insisted on the literal fulfilment of the Mosaic precepts, though they all had for him a secondary or moral meaning. But the Therapeutæ seem to have broken altogether with the Temple services and sacrifices of Jerusalem. Friedländer supposes that those passages in which Philo complains of the Allegorists, who went so far as to disregard the Sabbath, neglect circumcision and in other ways repudiate the letter of the law, are really aimed at the Therapeutæ. Another reason why Philo cannot have himself written the treatise is that in his undisputed works he blames those who, in youth, forsake the practical life and retire into the cloister. At the same time Friedländer realises how thoroughly the treatise in question belongs to Philo's age, how interpenetrated it is with the ascetic and allegorist influences which everywhere assert themselves in Philo's writings ; so that it is, as it were, "bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh." He therefore supposes that it was written immediately after Philo's death, and intercalated among his works after the treatise *That every good man is free*. For in this treatise Philo had eulogised the Essenes, but had here, as in all his other works, passed over the Therapeutæ in a studied silence. In their renunciation of property, says Friedländer, the Therapeutæ resembled the early Christians, and therefore Eusebius was right in finding a resemblance between them and the "Apostolic men" of his own age, and also of the first Christian epoch.

Friedländer then sketches out the asceticism of the Therapeutæ, and shows from Philo's works that it was a most characteristic product of Alexandrine Judaism. Their ideal was mortification of the flesh and consequent purification of the soul, in order that it may see God. Friedländer also shows that the ideal of female virginity, inculcated and practised by the Therapeutæ, quite accords with the general tone of Philo's works on the subject. He also proves that the statement that the Therapeutæ were found in many parts of the inhabited world, but

had their headquarters in Alexandria, is fully borne out by what we know of the diffusion of the Jews during the first century.

In such a religious community the narrowing and exclusive ceremonial of Judaism would have been relegated to the background, as something which hindered the approach of Gentile converts to the truth. "Of national Judaism, hardly a trace is left among the Therapeutæ. They honour the Sabbath and other Jewish feasts ; but these are only Jewish in name. The meaning ascribed to them is alien, philosophical, as repellent to an orthodox Jew as it was attractive to a Gentile in search of a purer cult than that of Paganism." In this respect the Therapeutæ went beyond the Essenes, who, while repudiating the Temple sacrifices, yet sent their offerings thereto, and observed the outward forms of the Jewish religion. Hence Philo extols the Essenes to heaven, but censures the Therapeutæ, when he cannot ignore them.

Chapter IV.—Der Essenismus. The Essenes were not Chassidim, were not a stricter sect of Pharisees, the residue of the anti-Greek Hasmonean movement, condemning themselves to isolation in order to maintain their ceremonial purity of life and diet. On the contrary, they were the pioneers and outposts upon Jewish soil of the ascetic and allegorising, yet in temper, more liberal and gentilising Judaism of Alexandria. They lived apart because they spoke Greek from the first. Their rejection of bloody sacrifices and of marriage, their allegorising of Scripture, attested by Philo, were Alexandrine traits, inexplicable if we regard them, with Lucius and Hilgenfeld, as the extreme right of the Pharisee sect. Just because they only spoke Greek the Talmud ignores them. For the Maccabæan movement was directed against Greek cults, and not against the use of the Greek tongue in Judæa. The use of this tongue was widely diffused among the Am-haarez or *basso-popolo* of Judæa, whose cause, as that of "the lost sheep of the House of Israel," Jesus championed against the ceremonial righteousness of the Pharisees. Of this popular party the Essenes had long been the leaders when Jesus came on the scene.

Friedländer quotes Josephus and the Talmud in proof that in many parts of Palestine Greek was the only language of the Jews. He points out that in Jerusalem itself 500 of Gamaliel's disciples talked Greek, and that the passage in Acts xxii. 2, where we read that Paul quieted the mob by addressing them in Hebrew, proves that the mob habitually spoke not Hebrew, but Greek. Otherwise Hebrew from a man accused of violating the law and of bringing Greeks into the Temple would not have arrested their attention.¹ That the entire early literature of Christianity

¹ F.'s argument is untenable ; for in chap. xxi. 37 the chief captain having arrested Paul and so saved him from the violence of the mob says to Paul, "Canst thou speak Greek?" implying that all around him were,

is Greek, is an additional proof of its common, daily and widespread use in Palestine.

Essenism then was the outcome of a missionary activity in Judæa by the Greek Jews of Alexandria. Its adherents kept their doctrines secret, because they were an outpost of Jewish Hellenism on foreign and hostile soil. In Alexandria they would have openly proclaimed the same tenets in the market-place. They were a propagandist sect in spite of their seclusion, and their constant travels mentioned by Josephus had a missionary aim. In the career of John the Baptist, who was one of them, their activity first comes to light for us; and he comes before us as the spokesman and champion of the Am-haarez against the spurious piety of the Pharisees. Had the Essenes not been Greek or Alexandrine in their language and influence, Josephus would not have troubled himself to assure us (*Bell. Jud.*, II. viii. 2) that they were Jews by race (*Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν γένος ὄντες*).

Friedländer points to many characteristics of the Essenes as essentially Alexandrine in origin, *e.g.*, their repudiation of animal sacrifices; their teaching of the immortality of the soul and of the sinfulness of the body, the prison of the soul; their faith that God is author of good alone, and not also of evil; their doctrine of creation and agencies mediating God with nature; their use of allegory; the axe (*ἀξινάριον*) worn by their novices. The latter custom Friedländer most happily and ingeniously parallels and explains from Philo, *Leg. Alleg.*, p. 117, in a way which makes it practically certain that Philo was acquainted with the inner symbolic teaching and discipline of the Essenes, and is here alluding to it—a point which it is of some importance to ascertain.

From the differing statements of Philo—in one place that the Essenes were in number 4,000, in another that they were *μύριοι*—Friedländer rightly infers that though there were only 4,000 who were of the highest grade (*τελείοι*), there were innumerable adherents of the sect up and down Palestine; and these adherents were the seed-ground of nascent Christianity, as Eusebius believed. The points of resemblance between the Essenes and the new-born religion cannot be otherwise explained. The common objection that the Essenes were recluses of the desert, whereas Christianity burrowed in populous centres has no weight; for Josephus testifies that Essenes often filled positions of authority, and Philo avers that they taught in their community *οἰκονομίαν* and *πολιτείαν*. Josephus also attests that they lived in many cities, and were constantly travelling. Their only possible motive in travelling was to preach and propagate their ideas.

and had been, uttering their cry of "Away with him," in Hebrew or Aramaic. Similarly the *Acts of Pilate* prove that the multitude of Jerusalem when they welcomed Jesus cried, Hosanna, etc., in Hebrew and not in Greek.

John the Baptist was such an Essene missionary, and was, as we can infer from the grudging tone assumed towards him in the fourth Gospel, the real founder of the Christian religion. He was regarded (Luke iii. 15) by his disciples as the true Messiah, and his baptism lingered on for many years in rivalry with that of Jesus. Josephus himself (*Antiq.* XVIII. v. 2) bears witness to the great and important part played by John the Baptist as a teacher "of virtue, of justice towards men, of holiness towards God," the three cardinal virtues—according to Philo—of Essenism. The circumstance that Jesus fled when he heard the news of John's beheading proves the truth of Josephus' statement, that Herod was actuated by fear of John's influence with the masses.

The Essenes were imbued with Messianic faith, and this brought them—men of peace though they were, and imbued with a belief in the duty of passive obedience, and persuaded that all authority is a gift from heaven—into conflict with the Roman government. For this belief according to Josephus, was the underlying reason of the great war which ended with the sack of Jerusalem by Titus. This catastrophe was a deathblow to their sect.

The Essenes are the "Chizonim," or heretical outsiders of the Talmud, who, for their repudiation of animal sacrifices, were excluded from the temple. Their use of the Greek tongue, their ascetic eschewal of marriage, and lastly their allegorising teaching, rendered them doubly heretical in the eyes of the Pharisees, to whom they cannot therefore be assimilated.

Chapter V.—Alexandria and Jerusalem. Alexandrine Judaism was a mixture of Mosaism and Greek philosophy. Philosophic ideas were discovered as *ὑπονοίαι*, underlying the letter of the Old Testament, and then the Greek philosophers, Plato and others, were said to have derived their wisdom from Moses. Such philosophic Judaism soon broke away from the Pharisaic legalism of Judæa, and established its own temple of Onias in Egypt, with a priesthood of its own. Its relation to Palestinian orthodoxy was exactly similar to that of Paul's Gentile gospel to the gospel of the circumcision. It spread from Alexandria to Judæa, and established its schools and synagogues in Jerusalem itself. Of the the revolt of this more liberal and spiritualised Mosaism against the literalism and the ceremonialism of the Pharisees, who excommunicated it as heresy, Christianity was the firstfruits. It was the rallying-point in Palestine of the poor and humble, who, slave-like, talked and read Greek, and could not endure the heavy burdens which the Pharisees strove to bind upon them. Christianity was a "vulgar Hellenism," and attests its origin in its use and retention from the first of the Septuagint. It arose out of the Jewish Diaspora, as the writings of Philo prove; for in them we find foreshadowed in broad but clear outlines the Christianity which was to be, whether friendly or inimical to the Mosaic Law.

Philo was himself conservative, and advocated the literal observance of the precepts, which he yet really valued only for the moral meanings which he read into them. But his writings attest that many of his countrymen threw the letter to the winds, and sat loose to the observance of the most vital parts of the code, to circumcision, to the Sabbath, to the feasts and fasts of Judaism (*De Migr. Abr.*, I. 450). We thus know that long before Paul there was a lax Judaism, hostile to the law, and that nothing was wanting to the rise of Jewish Christianity, save the appeal to the personal authority of a Christ sent from heaven to supersede the law with the freedom of the spirit.

It was the freer Greek Judaism of Alexandria which everywhere attracted the Gentiles, and it was spread broadcast by regular missionaries or even by Jewish merchants travelling primarily for gain (Josephus *Antiq.*, XX. ii. 4). The Pharisees followed in the steps of these more liberal propagandists, and tried to bring their converts into a stricter conformity with the Mosaic law, *e.g.*, to submit to circumcision.

A time came (alluded to in Luke xii. 2-5) when the more liberal Judaism of the Essenes, hitherto kept secret, was preached and revealed to the people of Palestine. John the Baptist was the agent of this revelation. His teaching was essentially Essenic. There was less of the Essene asceticism about the teaching of his successor, Jesus of Nazareth, but the latter was more vehement in his assaults on the Pharisees, more free-thinking in his attitude towards the Mosaic law, which he taught men to fulfil in an Hellenic and anti-Pharisaic spirit (Matt. v. 20 ; cp. Paul, Rom. iii. 31). He did not openly break with the law, however, or he would never have been acclaimed as the Messiah. His great achievement was to free the people from the burden of Pharisaic formalism, from the soul-slaying traditions of men. In this spirit he spoke the words: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Christianity, then, was a product of the Diaspora, and Friedländer concludes by pointing out the Hellenist antecedents of many of its earliest teachers, of Stephen, Barnabas, John, Mark, Paul, Apollos, the author of the letter to the Hebrews, etc.

Such is the gist of a very suggestive book. Its chapters are really essays on their respective subjects, and of them Chs. I. and II. are the most successful, because here the writer treads on firm ground throughout. His view of Therapeutism in Ch. III. is at fault. He is right in rejecting the view of Lucius, who pretends that the *De Vita Contemplativa* is a late third or early fourth century panegyric of Christian monachism, and in ascribing it to Philo's age and circle. But his reasons for denying the authorship to Philo himself are insufficient ; for it is not true that the Therapeutæ were heretical Jews any more than was Philo himself. The treatise *D. V. C.*, descriptive of them, indeed says that they looked upon the *νομοθεσία* of Moses as a *ζῶον*,

the body of which consists of the *ῥῆται διατάξεις* or literal precepts, but of which the soul (*ψυχὴ*) is the unseen reason (*ἀόρατος νοῦς*) which lurks underneath the sentences (*λέξεις*), and that in their Scriptural exercises they set themselves to bring out and exhibit the beautiful conceptions symbolised in the names (*or words*). It is true that elsewhere (*De Migr. Abr.*, 1. 450) Philo in making a similar comparison of the letter to the body, and of the allegorical sense to the soul of a *ζῶον*, condemns those who forget and reject the body in their enthusiasm for the soul, and go so far as to light fire and trade on the Sabbath, neglect circumcision and the Jewish feasts. The passage in the *D. V. C.*, however, does not even hint that the Therapeutæ, because they allegorised the Law, therefore neglected its literal fulfilment in any respect. As I have pointed out in the *testimonia* to the passage in my recent edition of the *D. V. C.*, similar descriptions of the relation of the letter to the spirit of the Law occur in other works of Philo, and their occurrence quite forbids Friedländer's inference. It is a fact that the allegorising activity of the Therapeutæ, as described in the *D. V. C.*, in no way differs from the same activity as described and warmly eulogised and defended everywhere else in the genuine works of Philo.

Friedländer's statement that the Therapeutæ sat loose to the Jewish feasts and to the Temple system of Jerusalem is equally unfounded. Their careful and *legal* observance of the Sabbath and of the Pentecostal feast is described at great length, and also their reverence for the shewbread and Levitical service of the Temple at Jerusalem (I. p. 484, 30). They ate, says Philo, at their Pentecostal meal leavened bread, out of reverence for the shewbread (*δι' αἰδῶ τῆς ἀνακειμένης ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ προνάῳ ἱερᾶς τροπέης*) and in order not to trench on the privileges of the sons of Zadok. "It is befitting," we read, "that the simplest and purest food should be awarded to the highest rank of the priests as a reward for their service (*λειτουργίας*), whereas the others (*e.g.* Therapeutæ) must aspire to a *like* portion, but abstain from the *same*, in order that their superiors may keep their privilege."

The philological affinities of the *D. V. C.* with the rest of Philo's works equally preclude the supposition that it is only an imitation. For example, we find in its brief compass some twenty rare words which occur nowhere else in Greek literature except in Philo. Nor is the enthusiastic tone of the treatise towards the ascetics it describes inconsistent with Philo's advice given in the *De Profugis* and elsewhere not to retire to the cloister before the age of fifty. The perfect (*τελείοι*) among the Therapeutæ may have been all over that age. The treatise is not sufficiently explicit on the point for us even to feel sure that the novices in the system were young men; we only read that youth and age were relative not to years, but to

knowledge less or more profound of the holy Scriptures. If Philo wrote so warmly of the Essenes who repudiated the Temple sacrifices, why may we not suppose that he wrote the description of the Therapeutæ, of whom no single heretical trait is reported therein? As for the allegorical explanations of the Sabbath and Pentecost given in the *D. V. C.*, we meet with exactly the same explanations of them in many other writings of Philo.

Chapter IV. — Friedländer's contention that the Essenes spoke Greek is not well supported. In favour of it is a fact related by Philo, but passed over by Friedländer, that they *called* their meeting-houses *Synagogues* (*συναγωγαί*); but this is far from conclusive. Nor do I see how Jesus, who thought that it is not meats which defile a man, but evil qualities, and who came eating and drinking with publicans and sinners, can have been a product of the Essene discipline and beliefs. For Josephus relates that an Essene expelled from the order died of hunger, because, like a Brahmin, he could not eat of any food save that which his fellows in the order had prepared. It is certain therefore that their *συσσίτια* were ordained to preserve unimpaired their ceremonial purity, and were wholly different in kind and purpose to the miscellaneous common meals of the early Christians. This objection Friedländer ignores, as also another, viz., that an Essene of the highest order was polluted by the mere touch of one of a lower grade. Such a custom has a very unchristian and Pharisaic air, and goes far to confirm the view that the Essenes were the extreme right of Pharisaism. It is not even certain that the Essenes rejected animal sacrifice for Alexandrine or Pythagorean reasons. It may have been in order to preserve their own ceremonial purity. Friedländer's equation therefore of the earliest Christianity with Essenism is very uncertain.

Thus Chapters III. and IV. need reconsideration, yet the general aim of the book is right, and Friedländer does good service in calling attention to the Alexandrine factor in early Christianity, and to the manner in which the religion originally arose out of the revolt of the common people, leavened with Hellenism, against the Pharisees.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.